



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Agnostos Theos. Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte Religiöser Rede, von EDUARD NORDEN, Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1913, IX + 410 pp.

During the winter semester of 1910-11 a company of scholars at the University of Berlin, comprising both theologians and philologists, read and discussed together the Book of Acts. Coming in the course of their reading to the account of Paul's visit to Athens, they made up their minds that as the scene lay in Athens, they would no longer be in subjection to the theologians (the 'Mitgriechen'), as they had been before. The *ἄγνωστος θεός* was an *ἄγνωστόν τι*. The cry was raised *ζητητέον*. The *ζήτησις* was undertaken and carried out by Norden, and being conducted in truly Socratic spirit, *ὅν' ἄμα τι μανθάνοιμι*, it has yielded numerous by-products, which are quite as valuable as the conclusions reached with reference to the main problems.¹

The book divides itself into two unequal parts. The first (pp. 1-142) contains a discussion of the authorship and sources of the Areopagus Speech, and of the origin and meaning of the term *ἄγνωστος θεός*. The second part (pp. 143-308) is devoted to investigations into the stylistic history of prayer and the formulae used in ascriptions. Then follow (pp. 311-387) appendices which deal with the composition of the Acts, the *λέξεις Ἀττικάί* in the Athenian chapter, the story of Apollonius of Tyana from which, according to Norden, so much has found its way into the narrative of Paul's sojourn at Athens. There is a remarkable study of the formula *ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα*, grotesquely illustrated by a vignette on the title page, in which the mystic serpent swallows its tail—sufficient indication of the Hermetic doctrine involved. There is a comparative study of Semitic and Hellenic sentence

¹ A great Christmas present this, says Reitzenstein, in a sympathetic and illuminating review (NJB, 1913, No. 2), a great Christmas present for philologists and theologians alike. Important as are the various questions treated, the great significance of the book for the theologian is the proof how indispensable classical philology is for the determination of religious problems, while the philologist is made justly proud of the way in which the history of words and the history of style serve to light up the course of the great transformation of thought and feeling in the commerce between Orient and Occident. To this effect Reitzenstein, I do not give his exact words. B. L. G.

parallelism; a study of the position of the verb in New Testament Greek, in which the author rejects with scorn the statistical method of Kieckers, well spoken of by other scholars. Then comes a chapter on the λέξις εἰρομένη, another on the Myth of Protagoras in Plato, in which he recognizes a mimicry of the great sophist, followed by a discussion of the Euhemerus of Ennius and the argumentum of a fabula palliata. The concluding essay deals with the formulaic participial and relative style in the New Testament—a bewildering array of subjects. No wonder that the average reader will come to the conclusion that the Areopagus Speech, with its reference to the ἄγνωστος θεός, is merely a convenient starting point for a number of studies in the history of religious thought and in their expression in literature. They are all connected directly or indirectly with the general problem of the interrelation of Greek and Semitic thought in the early Christian Church; but they differ from other studies in the same general field in the emphasis that they place on literary form as a means for tracing the development and spread of religious ideas. True, the results of the studies might have been given in a more concise and orderly form, but this could have been done only at the sacrifice of a feature of the book which is of special value: viz., the detailed presentation of the method employed in the investigation.

The comparison of the Areopagus Speech with a number of documents of both Christian and non-Christian origin reveals some striking correspondences, which Norden interprets as demonstrating the existence of a fixed type of missionary address, of 'Propagandarede', which was employed by representatives of varied faiths. The Areopagus Speech, like the other speeches in Acts, he regards as the work of a later editor, who in this case took for his model an address of Apollonius of Tyana delivered at Athens within a few decades of St. Paul's visit. By ingenious combination of references to the life and works of Apollonius, Norden tries to show that in this address Apollonius commended the Athenians for their piety as shown in the worship of ἄγνωστοι θεοί, and declared to them that the supreme god is not to be worshipped by the works of men's hands, but requires a spiritual worship. Norden's position in this matter was at once vigorously attacked by Harnack, a staunch champion of the unity of Acts, in a pamphlet entitled 'Ist die Rede des Paulus in Athen ein ursprünglicher Bestandteil der Apostelgeschichte?', in which he questions the validity of some of the inferences used in the reconstruction of the speech of Apollonius, and argues that even in its supposed form it does not sufficiently resemble the Areopagus Speech to make necessary the assumption that the latter is dependent upon it. On the other hand, Harnack

shows that the language of the Areopagus Speech is akin to that of the rest of Acts, and furthermore that practically all of the features emphasized by Norden in his discussion of the speech, such as the different point of view from that shown by Paul in his letters and the references to Stoic philosophy, are not incompatible with Lukan authorship.

A considerable portion of this section of the book is devoted to the study of the origin and meaning of the term *ἄγνωστος θεός* and the related terms *γνώσις θεοῦ* and *γινώσκειν θεόν*. A lexicographical study of the phrase *ἄγνωστος θεός* shows that it is not Greek in its origin: 'The existence of a predication of God as *ἄγνωστος* in documents that are beyond controversy purely Hellenic cannot be proved'. So too the allied phrases *γνώσις θεοῦ* and *γινώσκειν θεόν* are not found in documents of purely Greek origin, with the possible exception of Epicurus ep. ad Menoeceum, p. 60, 4, Usener: *θεοὶ μὲν γὰρ εἰσὶν ἐναργῆς γὰρ αὐτῶν ἢ γνώσις*, but are common in Jewish and Christian writings and mark a central conception in the Oriental religions in general. In circles where these expressions were current it appears that the true knowledge of God *γνώσις θεοῦ* was regarded as the result of revelation and not as an intellectual attainment—a conception which marks a fundamental distinction between Greek and Oriental thought in that the Greek trusted to his powers of reflection while the Oriental sought knowledge of God in inner experiences of a mystical nature.

In the second section (pp. 143–308) Norden examines the formulae used in addressing divinities in prayer, with a view to the discovery of some formal tests for separating Greek and Oriental elements in the writings of the Christian and of other syncretistic religions. He rightly insists that here as elsewhere in ancient literature the surer criterion is to be found in the form in which the thought is expressed rather than in its content. In documents that are known to be of Greek origin unaffected by Oriental influence he finds that the participle is used in titles of divinities without the article: e. g., Pindar O. 2, 13, *Κρόνιε παῖ Ῥέας, ἔδος Ὀλύμπου νέμων*. On the other hand in documents known to have been written in Greek by Hebrews or translated from Hebrew into Greek the participle is frequently used with the article: e. g., Prayer of Manasses, v. 1: *κύριε παντοκράτωρ, ἐπουράνιε . . . ὁ ποιήσας τὸν οὐρανόν*. The presence of the article in such passages is to be explained as due to a Hebrew idiom which passed over into the Greek.¹ When

¹ In my judgment Norden has pushed the articular participle business too far. Doubtless right in the main as to the Oriental effect of the repeated articular participle, he has brought in as unhellenic some examples that are as good Greek as anything in the language. Compare Reitzenstein, l. c., p. 152. The simple participle gives the ground of the

there are a number of parallel phrases a further test may be secured by observing the position of the participle in the phrase. So too in a series of relative clauses, Semitic documents show a tendency to place the verb at the beginning of the clauses, while in Greek documents the opposite tendency appears. In independent sentences a type of *δοξολογία* is found which is peculiar to Oriental religions. This takes the form of 'Thou art so and so', with the corresponding forms 'I am so and so' and 'He is so and so'. The god is described not in terms of his deeds as in Greek religion, 'Thou doest so and so', but rather in terms of his qualities and functions. This illustrates another fundamental difference between Greek and Oriental religious thought; the Greek is concerned with the concrete deeds and appearance of his god, while the Oriental is interested in his being and significance. The former gives a description, the latter a theory. In addition to these strictly formal tests, Norden in several places emphasizes the importance of another which is based upon the relation and sequence of the thought elements, *τόποι*, within the paragraph or larger unit. He argues that while it is possible for a number of concepts *a*, *b*, *c*, etc. to arise independently in the minds of both Paul and Apollonius, or to come to them from different sources, yet when each of them is found to group these concepts together in the same logical relations, then there is presumptive evidence of borrowing or of the use of a common source. It is at once apparent that such an analysis and comparison of thought groups is a much safer test than the mere comparison of Paul's *a* with Apollonius' *a* and Paul's *b* with Apollonius' *b*, etc. without reference to the interrelations of *a*, *b*, *c*, etc. in the thought of each. It should be noted, however, that the satisfaction of this test is far from being a mathematical demonstration; for the strength of the evidence is largely affected by the nature of the concepts and the relations that they naturally sustain to one another.

In the Appendices, filling 75 pages of fine print, Norden treats a number of topics which have been suggested by the previous discussion. In the first appendix he discusses the composition of the book of Acts and literary *γένος* of its 'Grundschrift', which according to his theory was a 'Reisebericht' containing the 'Wir-Bericht' and also certain narrative portions in the third person. Such a combination of the first and third persons he finds in certain passages in the works of Velleius Paterculus, Cassius Dio, and Ammianus Marcellinus, but in all these cases the 'Wir-Bericht' is given first hand by its own author. An instance of a 'Wir-Bericht' that has

appeal, as in the examples cited from Pindar. The articular participle identifies. It may have a causal significance, but not necessarily so. It is parallel with *ὅς*. In everyday prose the personal pronoun being definite has for its apposition the definite articular participle. B. L. G.

remained in the first person after being incorporated with other material by a later editor is not to be found in classical literature, but appears in the Old Testament books of Ezra and Nehemiah, and in the apocryphal book of Enoch. In Appendix V he calls attention to a distinguishing mark of Semitic parallelism in sentence structure. Unlike the Greek, it regularly repeats the word or phrase that is common to the different members, as in Rev. XVIII. 22, 23:

καὶ φωνὴ κιθαρωδῶν καὶ μουσικῶν καὶ αὐλητῶν καὶ σαλπιστῶν οὐ
 μὴ ἀκουσθῇ ἐν σοὶ ἔτι,
 καὶ πᾶς τεχνίτης πάσης τέχνης οὐ μὴ εὐρεθῇ ἐν σοὶ ἔτι,
 καὶ φωνὴ μύλου οὐ μὴ ἀκουσθῇ ἐν σοὶ ἔτι,
 καὶ φῶς λύχνου οὐ μὴ φανῇ ἐν σοὶ ἔτι,
 καὶ φωνὴ νυμφίου καὶ νύμφης οὐ μὴ ἀκουσθῇ ἐν σοὶ ἔτι.

Tried by this test, some of St. Paul's periods that have been regarded as models of Greek elegance prove to be Semitic rather than Greek in their structure. A comparison of parallel passages in Luke and the other synoptic gospels shows in general an avoidance of such repetitions on the part of Luke in his endeavor to secure a better Greek style. In Appendix VII, Norden brings together a number of observations on λέξις *είρομένη*. One of the most important of these is the correction of Deissmann's assertion that the presence of καί as a connective in a series of clauses is a mark of popular narrative style: 'Wenn z. B. Lukas 3, 4 f. eine Stelle des Jesaja zitiert *πᾶσα φάραγξ πληρωθήσεται καὶ πᾶν ὄρος . . . ταπεινωθήσεται . . . καὶ ἔσται . . . καὶ ὄψεται . . .* so wird sich nicht leugnen lassen, dass die serienweise auftretenden καὶ in der vorhin aus Lukas angeführten Erzählung ihren Ursprung nicht im λόγος *ιδιώτης* der Hellenen, sondern im λόγος *κατεσκευασμένος* der Semiten hatten, die nun einmal in solcher parataktischen Anreihung durchaus nichts Kunstloses gesehen haben'.

The freedom with which the author has allowed himself to follow the ramifications of his thought makes it difficult for the reviewer to give an adequate idea of the contents of the book. Its chief value may be said to lie in two things: in the numerous but somewhat miscellaneous observations on literary form, and in the introduction of more exact methods of source criticism in a field which has suffered at the hands of overzealous discoverers of similarities.

RALPH HERMON TUKEY.

WILLIAM JEWELL COLLEGE, LIBERTY, MISSOURI.

EDITORIAL NOTE. To Professor Tukey's summary of Norden's book I am tempted to add a paragraph originally intended for the chartered libertinisms of *Brief Mention*, which my foreign summarists usually dismiss as just so much surplusage, no matter how important the contributions to Greek syntax

contained therein. The recent publication of two translations of the Apollonius of Tyana by Philostratos has recalled to my mind my slight paper on the subject in my *Essays and Studies*, and a certain passage in that collection gives so forcible an illustration of the progress of doctrine—or shall we call it a change of attitude?—in the handling of the history of religions that I venture to reproduce my innocent argument against the notion that the work of Philostratos was intended to set up an opposition to Christ in the person of Apollonius:

Why not compare Apollonius and Paul? The resemblances are striking, nay, the coincidences are absolutely startling. Paul was educated at Tarsus; so was Apollonius. Paul fought with wild beasts at Ephesus; so did Apollonius. Paul preached at Athens; so did Apollonius. Paul noticed the altar to the unknown God; so did Apollonius. Paul's bonds were loosed in prison; so was it with Apollonius. Paul appeared before Caesar's judgment-seat; so did Apollonius. Paul, on his way to Rome, landed at Puteoli; so did Apollonius. Paul was suffered to dwell by himself; Apollonius was at first treated with similar civility. Paul withstood Peter; Apollonius withstood Euphrates. Paul had a thorn in the flesh; Apollonius had Damis. Paul woke Eutychus, who had fallen asleep; Apollonius woke the Roman maiden. There are various traditions of Paul's death, and no one knows the end of Apollonius. Finally, the Corinthian disciples of Paul assumed his name, and the Greek disciples of Apollonius took upon them the name of their master.

But this is sheer trifling. Read the Acts—read the Epistles of Paul, and ask yourself if there is any trace of real likeness between that soul of fire, that mind of light, that least yet chiefest of the Apostles, and this thing of mist and vapor, with its sickly lightning and its impotent thunder, a cloud-man, not a god-man, not a man at all?

It will be observed that in this parallel I fail to notice the important difference between the *ἀγνωστοί θεοί* of Apollonius and the *ἀγνωστος θεός* of St. Paul, on which Norden has laid due stress. But details of that sort need not detain us in view of the other changes that have come about in the last forty years. Reitzenstein classes the Acts with the travellers' tales of the Hellenistische Wundererzählungen (A. J. P. XXVIII 238), and now, as we have seen, Norden maintains that the Sermon on Mars' Hill has been smuggled in from the story of Apollonius, of which the ultimate author, Sancho-Panza Damis, whose very existence I once questioned, has become a real character. The parallel between Apollonius and St. Paul has ceased to be absurd, and some one will doubtless be found to identify Damis with Demas, who forsook St. Paul at Rome, 'having loved this world', and who in all likelihood made merchandise of his experiences with the Apostle, as Damis did of his experiences with Apollonius. The commonly reputed author of the Acts has recently been Romanized by Miss Stawell into Lucanus, and assigned to the family of Seneca. This brings the correspondence between St. Paul and Seneca into honour again. To be sure, Miss Stawell, so far as I know, has not yet published her list of Latinisms in Luke, and it is hardly

likely that Norden will support her contention. But these changes in the passing show are diverting, and reconcile one to a long life.

Courtly Love in Chaucer and Gower by WILLIAM GEORGE DODD (Harvard Studies in English, Volume I). Boston and London, Ginn and Company, Publishers, 1913. 8vo. Pp. viii, 257.

The title of this book is an engaging one. Those ideas of courtly love which had their beginnings in the chivalric courts of Southern France, where they found expression in the poetry of the troubadours, were developed systematically, and vitalised by the philosophic poets of Bologna and Tuscany, and culminated in the Beatrice of Dante's *Paradiso*, the superwoman, at once an angel and a higher intelligence. These Provençal conceptions rose to no such transcendent heights in Northern France. What had been poetical fancies and aspirations, at first adopted and fashioned into the set rules of etiquette of a select and artificial society, became a series of conventions, which were repeatedly formulated by didactic poets, and which established a norm for lyric poets to conform to. In English poetical literature, based on French models, we only find a shadow of a shadow of the original ideas.

To trace in detail the sources of Gower's and Chaucer's conceptions of courtly love affords an opportunity of making, not only a study in comparative literature, but also a contribution to the history of culture and the transmission of ideas. But one cannot study the influence of one literature and its tendencies upon another literature, without being thoroughly informed on the first literature in question. Now Mr. Dodd's knowledge of Provençal literature is confined to the translation of fragments of uncritical texts cited in Mott's *System of Courtly Love*, and to Ida Farnell's mistranslation of the *Lives of the Troubadours*. When six of the nine bits of troubadour poetry cited, is the work of Bernart de Ventadorn, it is unfortunate that the two statements made about him have no basis of truth. We are told that Eleanor of Aquitaine 'took a lively interest in the doctrines, as well as the practices, of courtly love. Before leaving her southern home to become queen of France, she received, and it seems, encouraged, advances of a very similar nature from the troubadour Bernart de Ventadorn. At the northern court, also, she lent her authority to the new doctrines. In this she was followed by her daughter, Marie of Champagne' (1). 'Bernart de Vent-